Attorney Docket No. 10808-229

Appln. No. 10/529,340

IV. Remarks

Reconsideration and re-examination of this application in view of the

above amendments and the following remarks is herein respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3-9, 11-14, and 17-25 remain pending. Claims 2, 10, and 15-16 have

been cancelled. Claims 1, 5, and 23 have been amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1, 3-4, 6-7, 11-14, 17-18, and 20-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C.

§102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. 6,392,432 to Jaimsomporn et al.

(Jaimsomporn).

Claims 1 and 13 recite that test structures and a detection unit are on an

integrated circuit substrate or in an integrated circuit arrangement. Jaimsomporn

does not teach these elements as being part of an integrated circuit arrangement

or on the same integrated circuit substrate. Rather, Jaimsomporn teaches

discreet devices that must be separately connected to the integrated circuit in a

test scenario and that may not allow testing after a certain stage of product

assembly. Therefore, Jaimsomporn does not teach the present invention as

provided in claims 1 and 13. Claims 3-4, 6-7, 11, 12, 14, 17-18, and 20-25

depend from claim 1 and are, therefore, patentable for at least the same reasons

as given above in support of claims 1 and 13.

BRINKS HOFER GILSON &LIONE Appln. No. 10/529,340 Attorney Docket No. 10808-229

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 5 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being

unpatentable over Jaimsomporn in view of U.S. 6,060,895 to Soh et al. (Soh).

Soh does not teach or suggest the elements noted above as missing from

Jaimsomporn. Further, claims 5 and 19 depend from claims 1 and 13,

respectively, and are, therefore, patentable for at least the same reasons as

given above in support of claims 1 and 13.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted

that the present form of the claims are patentably distinguishable over the art of

record and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Such action is

respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted by,

Dated: 12/21/06

Robert K. Fergan Reg. No.: 51,674

Attorney for Applicant(s)

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE P.O. Box 10395

Chicago, IL 60610

(734) 302-6000

## II. Amendments to the Drawings

Please replace sheet 1 of the drawings with replacement sheet 1 including amended Figure 1. The figures have been amended to include blocks 27 and 28 to identify the processor and memory as described on page 9, lines 32-38. Further, applicants respectfully submit that the second, third, and fourth test structure groups are shown in Figure 1 as T2-T4.